Remarks

Claim 1-5 and 31-40 are pending. Claim 6-30 are canceled in this Response.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3, 31, 32 and 34 have been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraphs 1-4 of the Office Action and to correct numerous other similar errors.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 3 was rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In support of the rejection, the Examiner states that Claim 3 reciting the marking imprinted on the edge portion and not imprinted on the facial portion appears to be contradictory to Claim 1 reciting the marking on a facial portion and on an edge portion.

The two claims are consistent. Claim 1 requires only a marking positioned on a facial portion and an edge portion. Claim 1 does not limit how the marking comes to be positioned there. Claim 3 requires that the marking be imprinted on the edge portion and not imprinted on the facial portion. The marking, however, can still be positioned on the facial portion by, for example, bleeding from the edge portion on which it is imprinted as shown in Fig. 3 and described in the accompanying text at page 6 of the Specification.

Applicant requests withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 and 31-40 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Hoppe (4278722) in view of Meunier (6582138). Claims 1 and 32 require a marking positioned on a facial portion and on an edge portion of the sheet. Meunier teaches a bar code or other such marking positioned on only the edge portion of a sheet. The Examiner asserts that Hoppe teaches a marking positioned on both a facial portion and on an edge portion of a sheet. This assertion is not correct.

Hoppe has no relevance to the claimed invention. Hoppe teaches a lamination process for a layered identification card that allows printing over the full face of the card. In Hoppe, the lamination film 6 is so thin that the printed pattern on the face of the card may extend without interruption "over the film edge 7 and possibly over the

PAGE 8/9 * RCVD AT 7/30/2004 2:21:02 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:208 433 9295 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-34

subsequent identification-card edge 8." Hoppe, column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 4. While Hoppe suggests printing "over" the edge of the card, it is clear Hoppe is not printing *on* the edge of the card as in the claimed invention. Printing "over" the edge in Hoppe refers to printing past the edge not on the edge, as is clearly evident in the figures.

Further, the so-called identification data noted by the Examiner is actually the "identification card data" printed on the face of the card, such as might appear on the face of a driver's license. This identification card data has absolutely nothing to do with configuring the imaging device as in Claim 1 (data for configuring an imaging device) or the characteristics of the sheet on which it is printed as in Claim 32 (media parameters corresponding to the sheet). Indeed, a contrary reading of Hoppe would lead to the absurd conclusion that the printed pattern on the face of the card is used to configure the imaging device to print the pattern itself.

Even if it is assumed Hoppe is analogous art and may properly be combined with Meunier, the combination does not teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 32. For this reason alone, the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 2-5, 31 and 33-40 also distinguish patentably over the cited references due to their dependence on Claims 1 and 32, respectively.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Haines

By _____
Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

July 30, 2004

PAGE 9/9 * RCVD AT 7/30/2004 2:21:02 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:208 433 9295 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-34